

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUCNDT #0229/01 0801557
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
O 211557Z MAR 07
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1568
INFO RUEHGG/UN SECURITY COUNCIL COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE
RUEHUNV/USMISSION UNVIE VIENNA IMMEDIATE 0651

C O N F I D E N T I A L USUN NEW YORK 000229

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 03/20/2011
TAGS: [PREL](#) [UNSC](#) [KNNP](#) [IR](#)
SUBJECT: UNSC/IRAN: INFORMALS MARCH 20

REF: USUN 213

Classified By: Ambassador Alejandro D. Wolff, Acting Permanent Representative, for reasons 1.4 b,d

¶1. (C) Summary: Security Council Ambassadors discussed the draft Iran resolution in "informal informals" on Tuesday, March 20. The UK hosted the meeting in response to requests from Council members for more information on the P-5's "political framework" to address the Iranian nuclear issue and in order to speed up the Council's delayed consideration of the draft text. The UK, France and U.S. introduced the basic elements and purpose of the draft resolution. Peru, Ghana, Panama, Belgium and Slovakia offered strong support for the text, as currently drafted. Italian comments were less direct, but did not indicate a problem with the text. Indonesia and Qatar previewed specific edits they will request, though none of their changes would impact the resolution's core operative paragraphs.

¶2. (C) Summary cont'd: South African PR Kumalo did not discuss the specific amendments offered in the South African non-paper (shared with the U.S. and others previously), which seeks to walk back the basic framework of UNSCR 1737, but said that he would do so during Wednesday's Council consultations. He did, however, argue that the resolution should be narrowly focused on Iran's nuclear program and the current draft "goes beyond" what the Council should be attempting to address. Congo, Russia and China were silent. By the end of the ninety-minute meeting, South Africa was effectively alone in seeking changes to the core operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, and Kumalo felt compelled to argue that his proposed changes did not amount to a "defense of Iran's actions." A number of delegations continue to call for the sponsors to make the necessary changes to ensure a unanimous outcome. End Summary.

¶3. (SBU) Security Council delegations met on the afternoon of Tuesday, March 20 in "informal informals" to discuss the draft Iran resolution presented to the Council by the P5 last week (reftel). The UK (supported by the U.S. and France) called the meeting when it became clear that efforts to accelerate negotiations in the Council were going to be stymied by the South Africa, Indonesia and Qatar. Council consultations on the text are now scheduled for Wednesday afternoon, March 21. In addition to giving delegations a chance to share views on the draft resolution, the "informal informals" allowed the sponsors to respond to requests for clarification of the "political framework" by which the P-5 and Germany seek to find a lasting solution to the Iranian nuclear issue. All fifteen Council members attended, but a number of delegations were not represented at the Perm Rep level.

P-3: Council action needed to ensure Iranian compliance

14. (C) In introducing the broader context for the resolution, UK PR Jones Parry and French PR de La Sabliere said that the P-5 and Germany share a common understanding that the Iranian nuclear issue should be resolved through negotiations. "The Security Council is not the framework for the settlement of this issue," he said. The Council should take incremental, reversible action that will compel Iran to return to negotiations, while constraining Tehran's proliferation-sensitive activities. In this regard, the proposed text should be seen by the rest of the Council as a means to support the process of political dialogue. De La Sabliere, in response to a number of questions from the elected members, provided details of the statement to be issued by the six governments concurrent with the adoption of the resolution in the Council. The statement, he said, would reinforce that the political track remained open to Iran, provided that they verifiably suspended their enrichment activities as called for by the IAEA and the Council. The statement would repeat the "suspension for suspension" offer embodied in UNSCR 1737 and make clear to Iran that future enrichment activities would be discussed as part of the negotiation. This would, he said, provide Iran "more than a face saver, it is an invitation to the future." De La Sabliere then called the attention of the elected membership to the offer put on the table by the six in June 2006. "This is a real offer that we have made."

15. (SBU) Ambassador Wolff said that the Security Council needed to act quickly to pass a resolution that reflected Iran's continuing non-compliance with the demands of the IAEA and the Council. At the same time, the incentives package offered Iran in 2006 remains on the table, and was included - by reference - in the draft resolution before the Council now. This was the six governments' "framework approach", designed to increase pressure and convince Tehran that

verifiable suspension of enrichment activities is key to resuming negotiations. The sponsors' broader focus on the Iranian military in this resolution, said Wolff, also reflected our core concern about the military nature of the Iranian nuclear and missile programs, and therefore was completely consistent with the overall approach laid out in UNSCR 1737.

South Africa, Indonesia, Qatar

16. (C) South African PR Kumalo said that he would have no problem supporting a resolution that dealt with Iran's nuclear issue, provided that it protected the "right of peaceful use" and reiterated associated disarmament provisions of the NPT. However, he said, the draft resolution "goes on to focus on people and entities not associated with the nuclear program." It was not clear, he said, how the Council would transition to the political track, "if Iran comes back tomorrow and says, 'We want to talk.'" (De La Sabliere responded that the provisions in the draft text on suspension and termination of the measures are entirely consistent with those established by the Council in UNSCR 1737.) Kumalo added that while "everyone" had heard of the proposed statement by the six governments, when the P-5's resolution was presented to the Council, "there was no document explaining the substance of this statement, its linkage to the resolution, or its sequencing." (Comment: In both Kumalo's intervention and an expert-level bilateral with South Africa's Johann Paschalis beforehand, we noticed some effort to distance themselves from the specifics of their non-paper and emphasize that they were acting under instructions from Pretoria. Paschalis went out of his way to note that they intended their paper - despite its tone - only as a starting point for negotiations with the P-5. End Comment.)

17. (SBU) Qatari PR Nasser emphasized that the Council had worked hard to adopt UNSCR 1737 by consensus, and we should not "go back" from that now. He suggested that the Council would better address the situation if it could include language related to the entire region previously included in

Council resolutions. He suggested that the sponsors consider language drawn from UNSCR 1284 that called for the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of WMD and their means of delivery. He emphasized the importance of consensus: "Don't push this through a divided Council, we should adopt at fifteen."

¶18. (C) Indonesian DPR Hasan Kleib said that Iran should be allowed to exercise its right to peaceful nuclear energy, but must guarantee that nothing from the program will be diverted to other than peaceful purposes. The Council must not close the door to a political solution. Specifically, Indonesia has asked for language similar to that requested by Qatar on regional WMD, an emphasis on the "three pillars" of the NPT, and additional "descriptive" information in the annex linking certain individuals and entities to Iran's nuclear and missile programs. (Privately, Kleib told Ambassador Wolff that Indonesia was not looking to remove individuals from the annex, "We just need better information to make the case to our Parliament and public.")

Broad support from the rest

¶19. (C) Speaking in support of the draft resolution, Ghana emphasized the importance of adherence to international treaties. "Our position is clear," PR Effah-Apenteng said, "We will not support any country that tries to violate the NPT." He said the draft served a good purpose, and focused on the military aspects of the nuclear program. Panamanian PR Arias said the Council must not back away from the course set by UNSCR 1737. The current draft is necessary, and it is consistent with the approach taken by the Council to date. However, he added, sanctions are the means, not the end. Every effort should be made to return to the negotiations.

¶110. (C) Peruvian PR Voto-Bernales said that Iran's reaction to the IAEA and Council had been "very disappointing". Iran has refused to negotiate and their public statements have "disregarded the authority" of the Security Council. "We have to conclude that the Security Council cannot go back in front of this challenge, but also cannot shut the door to a negotiated solution. This text strikes the proper balance." The sponsors' explanation of the incentives package, he added, was very helpful. Belgian PR Verbeke similarly expressed support for the resolution, noting that the measures were "reversible" and left the negotiating track open.

¶11. (C) Slovak DPR Matulay said the sponsors' approach was "logical" in the face of Iranian non-compliance, providing "sticks, carrots and an exit strategy." He encouraged the Council to act in a united manner. Italian DPR Mantovani offered more general thoughts in support of a negotiated solution. He did not express any concerns with the text as it stands, though he did suggest that the sponsors consider "how to make the incentives package more attractive to Iran."

South Africa on the defensive,
but to introduce amendments on March 21

¶12. (C) South Africa's Kumalo took the floor again, noticeably defensive after the rest of the Council failed to rally around his calls for a more narrow resolution. "Please do not see us as not worried about Iranian compliance. We say Iran must comply. But we need an assurance that this process won't threaten the rights of those of us who haven't done anything wrong." He emphasized the role of the IAEA, and asked why the draft resolution "goes beyond what we are trying to do." South Africa would support action against Iran and "not make excuses for them," but was concerned about the method. "If there is a criminal in the house, do you have to arrest everyone in the house?" He promised to go into the specifics of South Africa's proposed amendments during the Council's Wednesday, March 21 consultations.

(Following the meeting, Ambassador Wolff called Kumalo to ask for clarification on his stated concern that the resolution would somehow threaten the "rights" of other states. Kumalo admitted that there was nothing in the text to this effect, but "it is a general point of principle" for South Africa.)
WOLFF